

REMARKS

Claims 1-60 are all the claims pending in the application.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 54-60 are allowed and claim 19 contains allowable subject matter. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-18 and 20-53 are also patentable.

Also, in response to the Amendment filed on April 29, 2008, throughout the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner does not substantively respond to the Applicant's arguments. Applicant respectfully submits that where the Applicant traverses any rejection, the Examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the Applicant's argument and answer the substance of it (MPEP § 707.07(f) "Answer All Materials Traversed"), so as to expedite the prosecution for this application and to ensure a complete record of the prosecution history. Accordingly, those arguments remain applicable.

In addition, the Examiner does not state a one to one correspondence of each claim element with its prior art counterpart. Therefore, Applicant's arguments presented are based on a best understanding of the Examiner's analysis.

Information Disclosure Statements

Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner did not initial and return the Forms PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 21, 2008 and June 18, 2008. Applicant again requests that the Examiner initial and return the Forms PTO/SB/08 in the next USPTO communication.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 7 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Rom (U.S. Patent 6,360,264). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Rom allegedly teaches all the features of claim 7. *See* Office Action, pp. 2-3. However, Rom neither teaches nor suggests “A handoff method for an access point...comprising: collecting channel information on access points in an extended service set,” since Rom does not disclose that an access point collects channel information on access points. Rather, Rom describes that “the node acquires parameters from other access points.” *See* Rom, col. 4, ll. 64-65.

Further, Rom neither teaches nor suggests “collecting channel information on access points in an extended service set in response to receiving a handoff alert message from the mobile station,” since Rom does not disclose collecting channel information on access points “in response to receiving a handoff alert message from the mobile station.” Instead, Rom discloses that “[w]hen handoff is deemed necessary, the node acquires parameters from other access points.” *See* Rom, col. 4, ll. 64-65. Therefore, Rom does not teach or suggest “collecting channel information on access points in an extended service set in response to receiving a handoff alert message from the mobile station,” because Rom’s collecting is not in response to any handoff alert message, but is merely done when the mobile node deems it necessary.

Last, Rom neither teaches nor suggests “the collecting channel information and outputting a response message occurs prior to selection of a new access point in the extended service set,” as recited in claim 7. Rather, Rom discloses that “[a]fter selecting a new access point, the node communicates an instruction to the current access point...requesting the selected access point accept the handoff of the node.” *See* Rom, col. 5, ll. 18-22. Therefore, Rom cannot

disclose “the collecting channel information and outputting a response message occurs prior to selection of a new access point in the extended service set,” since the outputting a response message does not occur until after the new access point is selected.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Rom fails to teach all the features of claim 7, and hence Rom would not have anticipated claim 7.

Claim 42 recites features similar to those discussed above, and hence Rom also would not have anticipated claim 42 for at least analogous reasons.

Claims 5, 11-16, 18, 20-26, 28-30, 33, 34, 38-40, 43-46, 48-50, 52, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Lefkowitz (U.S. Patent 6,990,343). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 5

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz allegedly teaches all the features of claim 5. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz teaches the feature of “receiving a reassociation response message from the new access point in response to a temporary connection being established between the new access point and a previous access point of the mobile station.” Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the “REASSOCIATE-RESPONSE” packet at column 6, lines 39 to 50 of Lefkowitz allegedly corresponds to the claimed “reassociation response message.” *See* Office Action, p. 5.

However, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “receiving a reassociation response message from the new access point after a temporary connection is established between the new access point and a previous access point of the mobile station,” since Lefkowitz does not disclose that that STA 205 receives the “REASSOCIATE-RESPONSE” packet after a temporary

connection is established between WAP#2 215 and WAP#1 210. Indeed, the Examiner does not cite any portion of Lefkowitz for allegedly corresponding to the claimed “temporary connection...between the new access point and the previous access point,” since, most likely, Lefkowitz does not disclose a temporary connection between WAP#2 215 and WAP#1 210. Instead, Lefkowitz merely describes a connection between STA 205 and WAP#1 210 and a connection between STA 205 and WAP#2 215. *See* Lefkowitz, col. 6, ll. 29-32, 44-46.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 5, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 5.

Claims 11-15

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz allegedly teaches all the features of claim 11. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the STA 205, WAP#1 210, WAP#2 215, “REASSOCIATE-REQUEST” packet, and “DISASSOCIATE” packet at column 6, lines 27 to 46 of Lefkowitz allegedly teach “establishing a temporary connection with a previous access point of the mobile station in response to receiving a reassociation message” and “terminating the temporary connection with the previous access point in response to establishing the optimum connection,” as recited in claim 11. *See* Office Action, pages 6-7.

However, as discussed above regarding claim 5, Lefkowitz does not disclose that WAP#1 210 and WAP#2 215 establish any type of connection, and much less a temporary connection, as required by claim 11. Rather, Lefkowitz merely discloses a first connection between STA 205 and WAP#1 210, and a second connection between STA 205 and WAP#2. *See* Lefkowitz, col. 6, ll. 29-32, 44-46.

Similarly, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “A handoff method for an access point...comprising: terminating the temporary connection with the previous access point in response to establishing the optimum connection,” since Lefkowitz does not disclose that WAP#2 terminates a temporary connection to WAP#1 210. Rather, Lefkowitz merely discloses that STA 205 disassociates from its connection with WAP#1 210, with no teaching or suggestion that WAP#2 terminates a temporary connection with WAP#1 210.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 11, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 11 and its dependent claims.

Claim 16

Claim 16 recites limitations similar to those discussed above regarding claim 11, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 16 for at least analogous reasons.

Further, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 6, lines 22 to 26 of Lefkowitz allegedly teach “selecting a new access point by scanning channels according to channel information received from a present access point,” as recited in claim 16. *See* Office Action, p. 9.

However, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “selecting a new access point by scanning channels according to channel information received from a present access point,” since Lefkowitz does not disclose that STA 205 scans channels “according to channel information received from a present access point.” Rather, Lefkowitz merely describes that “STA 205 may perform a scan for signals from other WAPs of sufficient strength.” *See* Lefkowitz, col. 6, ll. 22-25. That is to say, STA 205 simply scans channels according to signal strength, but there is no

teaching or suggestion that STA 205 receives channel information from WAP#1, and hence STA 205 does not scan channels “according to channel information received from a present access point.”

As also discussed above regarding claims 5 and 11, Lefkowitz does not describe any temporary connection between WAP#1 and WAP#2, and hence Lefkowitz also fails to teach or suggest “reassociating with the new access point in response to a temporary connection being established between the new access point and the present access point.”

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 16, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 16.

Further, in the Office Action the Examiner asserts that claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lefkowitz. *See* Office Action, pp. 4, 9-10. However, in the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest “channel information received from a present access point.” *See* Office Action, p. 10. Accordingly, the Examiner’s rejection is deficient for at least this additional reason.

Claims 18, and 20-22

Claims 18 and 20-22 depend on claim 17 and incorporate all the features of claim 17. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz discloses all the features of claims 18 and 20-22. *See* Office Action, pages 10-12. However, the Examiner concedes that Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 17. *See* Office Action, page 10.

Accordingly, since the Examiner concedes that Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest all the features in independent claim 17, upon which claims 18 and 20-22 depend, Lefkowitz also would not have anticipated claims 18 and 20-22.

Claims 23-26

Claim 23 recites limitations similar to those discussed above regarding claims 5, 11, and 16. Specifically, claim 23 recites “a temporary connection/termination process unit which establishes a temporary connection with a previous access point of the mobile station using information included in the reassociation message.” However, as discussed above regarding claims 5, 11, and 16, Lefkowitz does not describe any temporary connection established between access point WAP#1 210 and access point WAP#2 215.

Accordingly, Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 23 and its dependent claims for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claims 5, 11, and 16.

Claims 28-30, 33, and 34

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz allegedly teaches all the features of claim 28. Specifically, the Examiner states that Lefkowitz discloses a WAP#1 (210), which the Examiner asserts corresponds to the “present access point.” The Examiner also states that WAP#1 (210) transmits a message to the STA 205 informing the STA 205 that it is moving out of the coverage area of WAP#1 (210). To this effect, the Examiner states that the above message corresponds to the claimed “channel information on access points different from a present access point in an extended service set.” *See* Office Action, p. 15.

However, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “a handoff alert message process unit which receives channel information on access points different from a present access point in an extended service set,” since Lefkowitz does not describe that STA 205 receives “channel information on access points different from a present access point in an extended service set.” Rather, Lefkowitz discloses that the message from the WAP#1 to the STA 205 is simply a message letting the STA 205 know that it is going out of the coverage area of WAP#1. *See*

Lefkowitz, col. 5, lines 38-45. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that such message contains “channel information on access points different from a present access point in an extended service set.”

Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Lefkowitz fails teach or suggest all the features of claim 28, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 28 and its dependent claims.

Claims 38 and 39

Claim 38 recites “receiving channel information on access points in an extended service set from a present access point of the mobile station,” which is similar to features discussed above regarding claim 28. Claim 38 also recited “scanning channels on the access points by using the channel information to select a new access point of the mobile station,” which is similar to features discussed above regarding claim 16.

Accordingly, claim 38 and its dependent claims would not have been anticipated by Lefkowitz for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claims 16 and 28.

Claim 40

Claim 40 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claims 5, 11, and 23, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 40 for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 43

Claim 43 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 11, and hence Lefkowitz would not have anticipated claim 43 for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 44

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz teaches all the features of claim 44. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that WAP#1 210 and STA 205 at column 5, lines 38 to 45

of Lefkowitz allegedly teach the feature of “controlling a channel information collection unit to collect channel information on access points in an extended service set in response to receiving a handoff alert message from the mobile station.” This portion of Lefkowitz describes that when WAP#1 notices that STA is approaching the outer limits of WAP#1’s coverage, WAP#1 transmits a message to STA to inform STA to search for a new access point.

However, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “controlling a channel information collection unit to collect channel information on access points in an extended service set in response to receiving a handoff alert message from the mobile station,” since Lefkowitz does not disclose that WAP#1 collects “channel information on access points in an extended service set.” Rather, Lefkowitz merely describes that WAP#1 detects a lower signal level from STA 205. *See* Lefkowitz, col. 5, ll. 38-45.

Further, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “controlling a channel information collection unit to collect channel information on access points in an extended service set in response to receiving a handoff alert message from the mobile station,” since Lefkowitz does not disclose that the WAP#1 collects channel information in response to a handoff alert message received from the mobile station. Rather, Lefkowitz merely discloses that STA 205 may initiate termination of communication with WAP#1, and STA 205 attempts to associate with WAP#2 215, with no teaching or suggestion that WAP#1 collects any type of channel information on access points in response to the termination request from STA 205. *See* Lefkowitz, col. 5, line 52 to col. 6, line 50.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Lefkowitz fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 44, and hence claim 44 would not have been anticipated by Lefkowitz.

Claims 45 and 46

Claims 45 and 46 recite features similar to those discussed above regarding claims 23-25, and hence claims 45 and 46 would not have been anticipated by Lefkowitz for at least analogous reasons.

Claims 48-50

Claim 48 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 28, and hence claim 48 and its dependent claims would not have been anticipated by Lefkowitz for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 52

Claim 52 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 23, and hence claim 23 would not have been anticipated by Lefkowitz for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 53

Claim 53 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 28, and hence claim 53 would not have been anticipated by Lefkowitz for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Dorenbosch et al. (U.S. Patent 6,850,503, herein after “Dorenbosch”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner asserts that Dorenbosch teaches all the features of claim 51. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the title and column 5, lines 10 to 20 of Dorenbosch teaches the feature of “A computer readable storage medium encoded with computer executable instructions for storing channel information on access points in an extended service set, the data structure comprising: address information on respective access points in the extended service set,” as claim 51 recites. *See* Office Action, page 27.

However, Dorenbosch neither teaches nor suggests a “computer readable storage medium encoded with computer executable instructions for storing channel information on access points in an extended service set, the data structure comprising: address information on respective access points in the extended service set,” since Dorenbosch does not disclose a computer readable storage medium, computer executable instructions, or a data structure.

Further, the Examiner asserts that column 6, lines 39 to 45 of Dorenbosch allegedly teach the feature of “information on channels used by the respective access points in the extended service set.” This portion of Dorenbosch describes that a device will determine a connection based on a signal strength from an access point, a loading level, or services provided by the access point.

However, Dorenbosch neither teaches nor suggests a data structure having information on channels used by the respective access points in the extended service set, since Dorenbosch do not disclose information of channels of access points. Rather, Dorenbosch merely discloses signal strength, loading levels, and services, with no teaching or suggestion of information on a channel of an access point.

Still further, claim 51 recites the feature of “information on one or more access points adjacent to each of the respective access points in the extended service set.” However, in the Office Action, the Examiner does not identify any portion of Dorenbosch as allegedly corresponding to this feature. *See* Office Action, pp. 25-26. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Dorenbosch neither teaches nor suggests such a feature.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, Dorenbosch fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 51, and hence claim 51 would not have been anticipated by Dorenbosch.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz in view of Zhong (U.S. Pub. 2006/0153133). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant notes that the PCT filing date of Zhong is November 27, 2003. Applicant also notes that Zhong claims priority from Provisional application number 60/432,534, filed on December 11, 2002. Therefore, the 102(e) date for the Zhong reference is December 11, 2002. The priority date for the subject application is January 23, 2003

In the Amendment filed on November 13, 2007 Applicant previously submitted a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. §1.131 submitted by Mr. Hyong-Uk Choi and Mr. Jun-Hwan Kim, the inventors of the subject application, demonstrating conception of the invention prior to the earliest effective filing date of Zhong, December 11, 2002, and due diligence from prior to December 11, 2002, and until constructive reduction of practice of the invention on January 23, 2003.

Therefore, again, the removal of Zhong as a reference is respectfully requested. As a result, claims 1 and 2 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Zhong.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 3 and 4 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Even if Lefkowitz could have somehow been modified based on Rom, as the Examiner asserts in the

Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claim 1, and hence claims 3 and 4, as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 3 and 4 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom for at least these reasons.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz as applied to claim 5, and further in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 6 depends on claim 5 and incorporates all the features of claim 5. Even if Lefkowitz could have somehow been modified based on Rom, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claim 5, and hence claim 6, as discussed above. Accordingly, claim 6 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom for at least these reasons.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rom as applied to claim 7, and further in view of Lefkowitz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 8-10 depend on claim 7 and incorporate all the features of claim 7. Even if Rom could have somehow been modified based on Lefkowitz, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claim 7, and hence claims 8-10, as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 8-10 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom for at least these reasons.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz allegedly teaches substantially all the features of claim 17. *See* Office Action, pp. 36-37. However, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “the access point comprising:...a channel information collection unit which collects channel information on a plurality of neighboring access points in an extended service set,” as recited in claim 17, since Lefkowitz does not disclose that an access point collects channel information on access points. Rather, Lefkowitz describes that access point WAP#1 detects a signal strength received from station STA 205, but Lefkowitz does not describe that access point WAP#1 “collects channel information on a plurality of neighboring access points.” At best, Lefkowitz describes that station STA 205, and not access point WAP#1, scans for signals from other access points having sufficient strength. *See* Lefkowitz, col. 6, ll. 22-25.

Rom is merely cited for teaching channel information in a response message, and also fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 17, and hence claim 17 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom for at least these reasons.

Claims 27 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hunkeler (U.S. Patent 6,950,655) in view of Lefkowitz. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Hunkeler fails to teach or suggest “a temporary connection/termination process unit for establishing a temporary connection between predetermined access points subject to the handoff operation, in response to a reassociation signal,” as recited in claim 27. However, the Examiner cites Lefkowitz to cure the deficient disclosure of Hunkeler. *See* Office Action, pp. 37-38.

As also discussed above regarding claim 23, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “establishing a temporary connection between predetermined access points,” as recited in claim 27, since Lefkowitz does not disclose establishing a temporary connection between access point WAP#1 and WAP#2. Therefore, Lefkowitz fails to cure the deficient disclosure of Hunkeler, and hence claim 27 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Hunkeler and Lefkowitz for at least these reasons.

Claim 47 recites features similar to those discussed above, and hence claim 47 also would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Hunkeler and Lefkowitz for at least analogous reasons.

Claims 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz as applied to claim 28, and further in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 31 and 32 depend on claim 28 and incorporate all the features of claim 28. Even if Lefkowitz could have been somehow modified based on Rom, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features in claim 28, and hence claims 31 and 32, as discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom would not have rendered claims 31 and 32 unpatentable for at least these reasons.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Lefkowitz allegedly teaches substantially all the features of claim 35. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the wireless communication

device STA 205 and access point WAP#1 of Lefkowitz allegedly correspond to the claimed “mobile station” and “present access point,” respectively. *See* Office Action, p. 42.

However, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “a handoff alert message process unit which receives channel information on a plurality of access points different from a present access point in an extended service set from the present access point,” since Lefkowitz does not describe that STA 205 comprises any unit that “receives channel information on a plurality of access points different from a present access point in an extended service set” from WAP#1. Rather, Lefkowitz merely describes that STA 205 and WAP#1 communicate to terminate a connection between STA 205 and WAP#1, with no teaching or suggestion that STA 205 “receives channel information on a plurality of access points different from a present access point in an extended service set from the present access point.” *See* Lefkowitz, col. 5, ll. 52-54.

Further, Lefkowitz neither teaches nor suggests “a scanning unit which scans channels on the access points for a new access point by using the channel information,” since Lefkowitz does not disclose that STA 205 scans channels on access points using any information, and much less channel information, from WAP#1. Indeed, Lefkowitz describes that STA 205 independently scans signals from other WAPs, with no teaching or suggestion that STA 205 “scans channels on the access points for a new access point by using the channel information,” which is received from the present access point. *See* Lefkowitz, col. 6, ll. 22-25.

Rom is merely cited for teaching channel information in a response message, and also fails to teach or suggest the features discussed above. Accordingly, the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 35, and hence claim 35 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom for at least these reasons.

Claims 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lefkowitz in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 36 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 35, and hence the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom also would not have rendered claim 36 and its dependent claims unpatentable for at least analogous reasons.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lefkowitz as applied to claim 40 above, and further in view of Rom. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 41 depends on claim 40 and incorporates all the features of claim 40. Even if Lefkowitz could have somehow been modified based on Rom, as the Examiner asserts in the Office Action, the combination would still not contain all the features of claim 40, and hence claim 41, as discussed above. Accordingly, claim 41 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lefkowitz and Rom for at least these reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 19 is objected to as allegedly being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully holds the rewriting of claim 19 in abeyance until the arguments with respect to claim 17 have been considered.

Claims 54-60 are allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christopher J. Bezak /

Christopher J. Bezak
Registration No. 63,241

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 18, 2008